Executive Summary: Your Volatility Strategy Review

Is It Better Than Before?

Short Answer: Technically yes, academically not yet.

What Improved: ✅ More sophisticated strategy (volatility vs. price) ✅ Better code structure and quality ✅ Comprehensive risk metrics (drawdown, VaR, CVaR) ✅ Professional visualizations ✅ Real hedge fund strategy (volatility dispersion is actually traded)

What's Missing: ❌ Economic rationale for WHY volatility spreads mean-revert ❌ Connection to "efficiently inefficient markets" framework ❌ Proper textbook chapter alignment (should be Ch 14/15, not Ch 9) ❌ Benchmark specification (HFR.com indices) ❌ Implementation details (data sources, rebalancing) ❌ Stationarity testing (half-life analysis)

What You Accomplished

Previous Strategy: Price spread pairs trading

- Long ASML/TSM/KLAC, short AMD/NVDA/AVGO when price spread is too narrow
- Economic logic: Supply chain relationships mean prices should move together
- Chapter 9 alignment: Statistical arbitrage, pairs trading

Current Strategy: Volatility dispersion trading

- Long low-vol basket, short high-vol basket when vol spread is extreme
- Economic logic: ??? (This is what's missing!)
- Better chapter fit: Chapter 14 (Fixed-Income Arbitrage) or Chapter 15

Three Critical Fixes Required

Fix #1: Add Economic Rationale (MANDATORY)

You need to explain why semiconductor equipment maker volatility should mean-revert toward chip designer volatility. Example:

"Equipment makers (ASML, TSM) have stable, long-cycle revenues from multi-year contracts. Chip designers (NVDA, AMD) face volatile quarterly demand from gaming, AI, and consumer electronics. When chip demand fears spike, designer volatility surges while equipment maker volatility lags (demand manifests in foundry utilization with delay). As markets digest chip cycle information, volatilities converge to levels consistent with shared semiconductor industry risk."

Where to add: Beginning of notebook, before parameters

Fix #2: Add Benchmark Specification (MANDATORY)

```
Primary Benchmark: HFRI Relative Value: Multi-Strategy Index (HFR.com)
- Represents market-neutral spread trading strategies
- Target Sharpe > 1.0 with market correlation < 0.3
```

Where to add: Before backtest section

Fix #3: Add Implementation Details (MANDATORY)

```
Data Sources: Yahoo Finance (daily adjusted close)
Rebalancing: Daily signals, can optimize to weekly
Transaction Costs: 5 bps per side (10 bps round-trip)
Position Limits: 100% gross exposure per pair
Risk Controls: (to be added - drawdown limits, correlation monitoring)
```

Where to add: After benchmark, before backtest function

Your Three Options

Option A: Go Back to Price-Based Strategy

Time: 2 hours **Difficulty**: Easy **Grade**: B+ to A- **Risk**: Low

Take your previous price spread strategy, add:

- Implementation details
- Benchmark specification
- Sensitivity analysis

Option B: Complete Volatility Strategy

Time: 4 hours **Difficulty**: Medium **Grade**: A- to A+ **Risk**: Medium (if you can't defend volatility mean

reversion)

Use current version, add:

- Economic rationale section (1 hour)
- Benchmark specification (15 min)
- Implementation details (20 min)
- Half-life analysis (30 min)
- Sensitivity analysis (30 min)
- Limitations section (30 min)

Option C: Do Both Strategies

Time: 6+ hours **Difficulty**: High **Grade**: A+ (if done well) **Risk**: High (time commitment)

Implement both, compare results, discuss trade-offs

Specific Suggestions for Improvement

Must Fix (Required for Academic Submission)

1. ✅ **Add economic rationale**: Copy from my "Code Additions" document
2. ✅ **Add benchmark**: HFR Relative Value Multi-Strategy Index
3. ✅ **Add implementation details**: Data sources, execution, rebalancing
4. ✅ **Fix chapter alignment**: Chapter 14 or 15, not Chapter 9

Should Fix (For Higher Grade)

5. **Add half-life analysis**: Verify vol spreads are mean-reverting
6. **Add sensitivity analysis**: Test different z-score thresholds
7. **Improve position sizing**: Weight by signal strength, not binary
8. **Add regime detection**: Adjust strategy in high-vol vs low-vol periods

Nice to Have (For Top Marks)

9. **Compare to price-based approach**: Show you understand both
10. **Add ML enhancement**: Predict which signals will work

11. **Include capacity analysis**: How much capital can strategy handle?
12. **Discuss live implementation**: Operational challenges, costs

---

Most Common Mistakes to Avoid

❌ **Submitting without economic justification**

- This looks like data mining, not strategy design
- Professor will ask "why should this work?" and you'll have no answer

❌ **Wrong textbook chapter alignment**

- Volatility trading ≠ Statistical arbitrage
- You're doing relative value arbitrage on volatility spreads

❌ **No benchmark comparison**

- Without HFR indices, can't evaluate if returns are competitive
- Course requires HFR.com benchmark per syllabus

❌ **Insufficient implementation details**

- "I downloaded data from Yahoo Finance" is not enough
- Need: frequency, adjustments, missing data handling, execution timing

❌ **Ignoring mean reversion validation**

- Just because historical backtest showed mean reversion doesn't mean it will continue
- Need half-life analysis to test stationarity

What Makes This Strategy "Efficiently Inefficient"?

You need to explain BOTH:

Why the Opportunity Persists:

- Different investor time horizons (retail vs institutional)
- Options market mechanics create volatility feedback loops

- Liquidity-driven volatility spikes during market stress
- Information diffusion lags across supply chains

Why Arbitrage is Incomplete:

- Transaction costs limit profitable trades (10 bps minimum)
- Timing uncertainty (spread might not converge for months)
- Basis risk (baskets may not move together as expected)
- Model risk (mean reversion is stochastic, not guaranteed)
- Execution complexity (maintaining market-neutral positions)

Without explaining both, you haven't connected to the framework!

Files I Created for You

1. **Strategy_Assessment_and_Improvements.md**
   - Detailed comparison of old vs new approach
   - Comprehensive analysis of strengths and weaknesses
   - Specific improvement recommendations
2. **Code_Additions_for_Academic_Rigor.md**
   - Ready-to-paste code and markdown sections
   - Economic rationale templates
   - Half-life analysis function
   - Sensitivity testing code
3. **Quick_Decision_Guide.md**
   - Side-by-side comparison table
   - Time-based action plans
   - Decision criteria
   - Honest assessment of each option
4. **This Executive Summary**
   - Quick reference for key points

- Critical fixes checklist
- Common mistakes to avoid

My Recommendation

If you have 4+ hours: Complete the volatility strategy with all critical fixes

- It's more impressive than price-based
- Shows deeper understanding
- Real hedge fund strategy
- BUT requires proper justification

If you have < 3 hours: Go back to price-based strategy

- Safer, easier to defend
- Perfect textbook alignment
- Clear economic foundation
- Solid B+ to A- grade

If you have 6+ hours and want top marks: Do both

- Compare and contrast approaches
- Discuss which works better and why
- Demonstrate mastery of both methodologies

Next Steps

1. **Decide** which option (A, B, or C) based on time available
2. **Read** the relevant documents I created
3. **Add** the critical fixes (economic rationale, benchmark, implementation)
4. **Test** your additions by asking yourself: "Can I defend this to my professor?"
5. **Export** to PDF or HTML for submission

Questions to Ask Yourself Before Submitting

✅ Can I explain why volatility spreads should mean-revert?
✅ Can I connect this to the "efficiently inefficient" framework?
✅ Do I have proper benchmark specification?
✅ Are my implementation details complete?
✅ Did I test for mean reversion (half-life analysis)?
✅ Did I run sensitivity analysis on parameters?
✅ Can I defend this strategy verbally if asked?

If you answered NO to any: Fix it before submitting!

Bottom Line

Your **code is excellent**, but your **academic framing is incomplete**. You've built a sophisticated volatility trading strategy, but without connecting it to economic theory and the "efficiently inefficient markets" framework, it looks like data mining.

With 4 hours of focused work adding the critical sections I outlined, this becomes an A-level submission that demonstrates advanced understanding.

Without these additions, you risk getting questions you can't answer and losing points for incomplete theoretical foundation.

The choice is yours. The materials are ready. Now execute.

Contact Points in My Documents

- **Full Analysis**: See "Strategy_Assessment_and_Improvements.md"
- **Code to Add**: See "Code_Additions_for_Academic_Rigor.md"
- **Decision Help**: See "Quick_Decision_Guide.md"
- **Quick Reference**: This document

All documents are ready to use. Good luck!